ν√

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,121	04/30/2001	Joseph B. Elad	QUANTUM-1	5233

54884   7590   09/22/2006

GOMEZ INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE, LLC
1501 N. RODNEY STREET
SUITE 101
WILMINGTON, DE 19806

EXAMINER
DASS, HARISH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3693	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/846,121	ELAD ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Harish T. Dass	3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 July 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-60</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-56</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) <u>57-60</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

7/5/2006 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

2.   Newly submitted claims 57-60 are directed to an invention that is independent or

distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: independen claim

adds a limitation "creating a buyer's specification of at least one market protocol", and

protocol related limitations, which was not presented in original set of claims, which

requires separate search in separate class. Original presentation was for computer

system.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented

invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for

prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 57-60 are withdrawn from consideration

as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP §

821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term

of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine

the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled

in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process*

Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp., 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed.

Cir. 1999). The term "ontology" in claim 18 is used by the claim to mean "meta-data",

as it defined by applicants in remarks to claim 18, while the accepted meaning is not

defined in any computer dictionary. The term is indefinite because the specification

does not clearly redefine the term.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to
> which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in
> which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shoham et al (hereinafter Shoham - US 6,584,451) in view of Lupien et al (6,012,046).

Re. Claim 1, Shoham discloses (a) creating a *buyers* abstract representation of at least

one attribute of a request, and the relationship between at least one utility of the request

and at least one state of the at least one attribute *[see entire document particularly -*

Abstract; Figure 2; C2 L1-L32; C3 L40-L59; C4 L41-L47; C12 L25-L30]; (b) creating a

sellers abstract representation of at least one attribute of an offer, and the relationship

between the total price of the offering and at least one state of the at least one attribute

[Figures 6A-6B; C2 L47-L56]; (e) signaling that the quantities and identities of

assignments are accepted and that the transaction is committed by *buyers* and *sellers*

[figures 6B, 12#1232; C2 L25-L27; C6 L9-L16]. *Shoham does not explicitly disclose* (c)

computing a rating for overall satisfaction of the at least one attribute of a request with

respect to a given offer, and (d) determining the quantity and identity of assignments of

sellers' offerings to *buyers'* requests that produces the best set of matches for a given

market. However, *Lupien* discloses (c) computing a rating for overall satisfaction of the

at least one attribute of a request with respect to a given offer, and (d) determining the

quantity and identity of assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests that

produces the best set of matches for a given market *[Lupien – abstract; C1 L50-L52; C2*

L65 to C3 L5; C11 L21-L46] to provides a substantially greater price discovery across

the full range of trade sizes. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was

made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham and

include computing a rating for overall satisfaction of the at least one attribute of a

request with respect to a given offer, and (d) determining the quantity and identity of

assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests that produces the best set of

matches for a given market, as disclosed by Lupien, to provide a crossing network that

matches buy and sell orders (items, goods, etc.) based on satisfaction and quantity

profile.

Re. Claim 2, *Lupien further* discloses (a) recording the request and offer data, along

with the transaction price and quantity, for the committed transactions, and for other

transactions that scored sufficiently well, and for requests and offers that were not

matched in the market*[Lupien –C6 L14-L29] to store the buyers/sellers profiles in

database which can be used later.* (b) inferring (COLLECTING) market value

relationships from other data sources, such as *sellers'* advertisements, and or *buyers'*

requests for proposals (market prices

) *[C1 L50-52] to set a market price.* And (c) using of mathematical function

approximation techniques for constructing market value functions that describe the

relationship between price and the states of various attributes in a hypothetical market

[C5 L1-L7; C14 L25-L40] to compute a single size and price for transition. "It would have

been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the

art to combine the disclosures of Shoham and Lupien to provide a system which can

store market data and utilize the data to calculate price based on the stored and

accumulated values for better approximate market value or average value.

Re. Claims 3-4, Shoham discloses (a) forming the best partition of the *buyers'* requests into groups or singletons of requests whose representation of attributes can be satisfied by the same *seller* offering *[C4 L56 to C5 L15]*;(b) forming the combined abstract representation of the requests for the consortium, said representation which will satisfy each *buyer* in the consortium*[C1 L50-L60]*. *Shoham does not explicitly disclose* (c) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the *buyers* in the consortium. However, Lupien further discloses this step [C1 L40-L67] to preserve the anonymity of the traders. "It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the disclosures of Shoham and Lupien to not discloses the identity of the trader as a business practice and better competition.

Re. Claim 5, Lupien further discloses wherein the at least one attribute includes both intrinsic qualities of the object of the request or offer, and extrinsic qualities of the transaction or market protocols, wherein the extrinsic attributes comprise commitment protocols and time qualifications [C5 L1-L7] to allow traders to input variables (attributes) other than price and quantity as a profile to provide specifics what they are looking for. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham and include intrinsic qualities and extrinsic qualities of trading object to better describe the nature of the object of trade.

Re. Claim 6, Shoham discloses (a) combining abstract representations from at least two

market participants, to combine maximize the satisfaction for the consortium of those

participants, and

(b) using *buyers'* consortiums rather than individual *buyers* and *sellers'* consortiums, or

individual *sellers*, in determining the best set of matches, and whereby a transaction can

be accomplished between consortia, rather than individual *buyers* and *sellers* (OBCS

and SellCo which can be a company made of sellers e.g., agricultural cooperative club)

[C2 L33-65].

Claims 28-33 have same limitations as claims 1-6 above, respectively. Therefore these

claims are rejected with same rational as claims 1-6.

Claims 7-13, 16, 18, 22-27 and 34-40, 43, 45, 49-56, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoham and Lupien, as applied to claims 1-6 and

28-33 above, further in view of Conklin et al (hereinafter Conklin – US 6,141,653).

Re. Claim 7, Shoham discloses (a) forming the best partition of the *buyers'* requests into

groups or singletons of requests whose representation of attributes can be satisfied by

the same *seller* offering *and* (b) forming the combined abstract representation of the

requests for the consortium, said representation which will satisfy each *buyer* in the

consortium *[C2 L57 to C3 L7; C4 L47 to C5 L14]. Shoham does not explicitly disclose*

(c) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the buyers in the consortium; and automatically joining sellers' offerings in a consortium by: (d) forming the best partition of the sellers' offerings into groups or singletons of offerings which considered together achieve the highest values on hypothetical market transactions, with regard to the value functions constructed in claim 2; (e) forming the abstract representation of the offerings for the consortium, said representation which will represent each offer in the consortium; and (f) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the sellers in the consortium, and using the market value data from transactions to construct mathematical function approximations predicting the value of states of attributes for hypothetical transactions to construct a stream or compendium of market information. However, Conklin discloses (c) constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the *buyers* in the consortium; and automatically joining *sellers*' offerings in a consortium by: (d) forming the best partition of the *sellers*' offerings into groups or singletons of offerings which considered together achieve the highest values on hypothetical market transactions (e) forming the abstract representation of the offerings for the consortium, said representation which will represent each offer in the consortium; and (f) a means of constructing an artificial negotiating entity that will represent at least one consortium, and can conceal the identities of the *sellers* in the consortium, and using the market value data from transactions to construct mathematical function approximations predicting the value of states of attributes for

hypothetical transactions to construct a stream or compendium of market information [Abstract; Figures 1c, -1g, 1j-1n, 3; C8 L49-L52; C18 L37-L65; C25 L21-L34] to provide comprehensive iterative bargaining abilities for both buyers and sellers that enable them to negotiate all the terms and conditions of a transaction not just the price. Lupien discloses and using the market value data from transactions to construct mathematical function approximations predicting the value of states of attributes for transactions to construct a stream or compendium of market information [C7 30-L53C20 L54 to C22 L45] to achieve highest value of mutual satisfaction. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Shoham and Lupien and add artificial negotiating entity and hypothetical market transactions, as disclosed by Conklin to provide comprehensive negotiating abilities for both buyers and sellers that enable them to negotiate all the terms and conditions of a transaction not just the price.

Re. Claims 8-13, Lupien further discloses further comprising numerically representing the determination of best assignments and quantities as an optimization problem and optimizing the assignments and quantities by finding the total of each *buyer's* and each *seller's* satisfaction with the transactions to be committed, comprises matching the at least one attribute of a request and the at least one attribute of an offer by inferring the match of the attribute qualities of a request which are logically implied by attribute qualities of an offer, and further comprising determining the quantity and identity of assignments of *sellers'* offerings to *buyers'* requests which produce the best set of

feasible matches for a given market, linear regression, numeric optimization, comprising

using a total market excess value as the measure of highest total market value

(satisfaction density) [C12 L33 to C14 L55; C12 L33-L36 (linear regression); C13 L48 to

C14 L8 (numeric optimization)] to provide optimization approach which maximizes

sequentially the mutual satisfaction at each stage of the allocation process, by assigning

allocations based upon the highest remaining mutual satisfaction value and where the

approach has the virtue of being computationally tractable and generally yielding

allocations with tight spreads in price. It would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure

of Shoham and Conklin and add optimization, as disclosed by Lupien, to best attributes

which satisfies the transactions between the sellers and buyer.

Re. Claim 16 Shoham wherein the request and offer data, the transaction price and

quantity, the committed transactions, other transactions that scored sufficiently well, and

the requests and offers that were not matched in the market are made available to

market participants [C7 L5-L45].

Re. Claim 18, Shoham or Lupien does not explicitly disclose wherein an ontology is

used for inferring the match of the at least one attribute state of a request which is

logically implied by the at least one attribute state of an offer. However, ontology or

meta-data (as defined by the applicant in remarks) is known in object oriented software

to capsulate the attributes, properties and functions associated with the property of a

instance of an object (class) and store the object as a tool which can be modified

without changing the software as whole and make use of the defined object as an entity.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham and Lupien and include

meta-data to make use of object oriented software for ease of use and maintenance of

the software.

Re. Claims 22- 24, Shoham does not explicitly disclose invoking auction protocols when

there is at least two requests per one offer or at least two offers per one request,

wherein the abstract representation of the relationship of the utility of an attribute of the

request, is created using at least one technique selected from the group consisting of

(a) linear functions, (b) piece-wise linear functions, (c) logistic functions,

(d) cubic splines, (e) look-up tables, and (f) other numeric functions that compute utility

with respect to a given attribute's states, and wherein the abstract representation of the

relationship between price of the offer and at least two states of an attribute of the offer,

is created using at least one technique selected from the group consisting of (a) linear

functions, (b) piece-wise linear functions, (c) logistic functions,

(d) cubic splines, (e) look-up tables, and (f) other numeric functions that compute price

with respect to a given attribute's states. However, these are will known for example,

generally auction has more than one offer only the highest wins and statistical

calculations are commonly down to calculate and predict the probability of success and

efficiency of a process or an outcome with costly experiment. It would have been

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Shoham, Lupien and Conklin to add statistical analysis to predict the success of auction prior to auctioning the goods or service.

Re. Claim 25, Shoham discloses further comprising communicating the abstract representations of requests and offerings by termsheets and offersheets, respectively (allow buyers to quote prices and invite sellers to accept the quote and purchase terms) [C1 L24-L28; C10 L38-L50].

Re. Claim 26, Shoham does not explicitly further comprising describing the requests as employment positions and describing the offerings as employee attributes and compensation requirements. However, this is well known that an agent can request for employment.

Re. Claim 27. Shoham discloses further comprising describing the requests as tasks to be accomplished, and describing the offers as agents, people and or software, willing to accomplish those tasks [C1 L2 L17-L31].

Claims 34-40, 43, 45, 49-54 have same limitations as claims 7-13, 16, 18, and 22-27 above, respectively. Therefore these claims are rejected with same rational as claims 7-13, 16, 18, and 22-27.

Re. Claim 55, Shoham discloses wherein the information is communicated through the
internet by internet protocol messages[C1 L15-L20].

Re. Claim 56. Shoham does not explicitly disclose wherein buyers and sellers access
the system via web pages, Java clients, or other executable client programs. However,
this is well known to which allows the user (buyer/seller) to place order using commonly
distributed web browsers.

Claims 14-15, 17, 41-42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Shoham, Lupien and Conklin as applied to claims 10 and 37 above,
and further in view of Verba et al (hereinafter Verba – US 6236977).

Re. Claims 14-15 and 17, Neither Shoham nor Lupien or Conklin discloses comprising
using a multiagent system to distribute the processing across many processors and
memory devices to achieve timely calculations of best assignments and quantities,
wherein a measure of the utility at the least one state of the at least one attribute is used
to compute a rating for the overall satisfaction of a request with respect to a given
offering by using at least one technique selected from the group consisting of: (a)
weighted fuzzy-logic conjunction operators, (b) weighted geometric means, (c) a
weighted version of Yager's T-NORM, (d) weighted arithmetic means, and (e) a
weighted combination, with the weights derived via analytic hierarchy analysis, and

wherein different instances of at least one module of the entire system is specialized for

each different market. However, Verba discloses these steps [Abstract; Figures 1-4, 9;

C2 L13-L36; C3 L26-L37; C4 L38-L60; C6 L24-L53; C22 L66 to C23 L56] to creating a

uniform measure of value and a sophisticated computer-implemented business

management system, which describes both in general terms, and with respect to

specifics useful in real estate marketing where the buyer has its own requirements. It

would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Shoham, Lupien and Conklin and

include multi-agent system with mathematical algorithm to create a uniform value and a

market (buy/sell) system to help agents in marketing their goods and service.

Claims 41-42 and 44 have same limitations as claims 14-15 and 17 above, respectively.

Therefore these claims are rejected with same rational as claims 14-15 and 17.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/5/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant is required to consider entire prior documents. Examiner tries his best

to include at least one passage that describe the concept related to the applicant's

invention.

In response to Applicant's argument (page 18 remark) recites ""(a) creating a

buyer's abstract representation of at least one attribute of a request, and the relationship

between at least one utility of the request and at least (me slate of the at least one

attribute." This assessment is inaccurate. ..." 1. Shoham discloses product and goods

[col. 3 line 31-33; col. 4 lines 10-23 and an example col. 4 line 663 to col. 5 line 13] and

"buyer purchase specification" [claim 1, page 8 line 66] and description of goods or

service [claim 7, page 9 line28-29]. It is obvious to one ordinary skill in the art of

procurement that any product/service has attributes (which describes the product and

its utility such as part number and model number) and these attributes are included

purchase specification which describes the utility and state of an arbitrary attribute, for

example, a designer of way-side substation requires a circuit breaker (contactor) 360

KVA either he/she has to provide a part number from a catalog or specify in his request

or specification the power, size and may be connection type of the circuit breaker,

otherwise how the supplier knows what to price and sell. An automation of such a

manual process is not a patentable idea (see In re steele). For example, Shoham

discloses [col. 4 lines 65] "Fords" and "Cadillacs", which are known to be motor vehicle

(at least in USA). The purchase specification describes what type of vehicle (utility and

one attribute– truck & size, tow-truck, car & size), options (color), etc. in addition to price

and quantity.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims In response to applicant's argument (page

18) that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted

that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "This is substantially different from the

specifications used in the DME") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). . See In re

Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument (page 19) that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "Shoham does mention that a schedule could depend on quantity, particular

products and options, the prices of competitors, and a new schedule "submitted for

other reasons." and "Shoham does not describe a system for representing arbitrary

attributes of an offer, or for relating the price of the offer to such attributes) are not

recited in the rejected claim(s). See In re Van Geuns.

In response to applicant's argument (page 19) that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "committed protocol") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). See In re Van

Geuns.

In response to applicant's argument (page 20) that the references fail to show

certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which

applicant relies (i.e., "non-market" and "rank-order") are not recited in the rejected

claim(s). See In re Van Geuns.

In response to applicant's argument (page 20) that there is no suggestion to

combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the

claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so

found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir.

1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case,

providing optimization approach which maximizes sequentially the mutual satisfaction at

each stage of the allocation process, by assigning allocations based upon the highest

remaining mutual satisfaction value and where the approach has the virtue of being

computationally tractable and generally yielding allocations with tight spreads in price

[C12 L33 to C14 L55; C12 L33-L36; C13 L48 to C14 L8].

In response to applicant's argument that (page21) Lupien is nonanalogous art, it

has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's

endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the

applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the

claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, matching of buyers and sellers bid and offer based on a satisfaction

and profile and matching the specification of the buyer and seller for a product or

service are same as a financial transactions based on auction.

In response to applicant's argument (page 21) that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "average price") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). See In re Van Geuns.

Referring to applicants arguments pages 22-35, applicant argument failed to point out

the missing limitation(s), instead explains the prior arts in general way.

In response to applicant's argument (page 27) that secondary reference "Lupien does

not disclose how to represent the degree of buyer or seller ..." Secondary reference

discloses what is not disclosed by the primary reference. See primary reference(s), which discloses an online buying/selling concept for goods and service, which are presented by procurement/specification.

In response to applicant's argument Shoham does not disclose use of ontology, Applicant failed to disclose in original specification "ontology" which is applicant's defined work. Examiner scanned the original specification and did not find any reference to "ontology", therefore, examiner used the word as it is defined in google and Webster dictionary and related to purchase specification (which defines an object with attributes or product part number/model). Applicant failed to provide page number(s) from original specification which defines this word. If applicant insists that this is a well-known (to an ordinary skill in the art) and acceptable word for meta-data, it should provide a reference such as computer dictionary, which defines this term. Examiner will be happy to provide prior art references for meta-data or classes (OOP), which defines an object with attributes.

Applicant argument failed to point out the missing limitation(s), instead applicant explains (page 19-35) the prior arts in general way.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 CFR ' 1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this action.

US 6,167,564 (Fontana et al.) discloses a system for integration of software

development tools and applications into a system in order to build a heterogeneous

development framework, and Protocol such as XML, UML, etc.

US 5,446,885 (Moore et al.) discloses rule-based application to allows a user to

modify existing rules and create new rules, store the rules as an object in a database

and retrieve the rules form the database for future use or modification with little effort.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-

6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harish T Dass
Examiner
Art Unit 3693

HTD